	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/923,626	BONAKDAR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sabiha Qazi	1616
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Sabiha Qazi</u> .	(3)	
(2) Aaron Ettelman.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 10 March 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ App  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	licant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: USC 103		
Claims discussed: 1-19		
Prior art documents discussed: HUNT et al		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	NERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separat directly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separat did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ</li> </ul>	The examiner will provide a writtence of the	en summary of the substance
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica	ant/Applicant's Representative Sig	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Attorney Aaron Ettelman to discuss the term "mild" in claim 1 and the differences between the instant invention and the prior art. Mr. Ettelman argued that the differences mainly lie in the "mild" conditions at step b in claim 1. The Examiner referred to the definition of "mild" in the Specification, where it is not patentably specific. The Examiner suggested that the Applicants amend the claims to make them more specific. Unfortunately, no agreement was reached..